Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/588,287	FUJINO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Deborah Yee	1793	

		Deborah Yee	1793	
The I	MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILE	ED <u>17 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
application, application	as filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on applicant must timely file one of the following in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe ed Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
b) The peri no even Examine	riod for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date iod for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A t, however, will the statutory period for reply expire \mathbf{k} er Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time I have been filed is the under 37 CFR 1.17 set forth in (b) above	IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the date for purposes of determining the period of extraction is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later right patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). PEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
filing the No	of Appeal was filed on A brief in compotice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter ppeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The propose (a) They (b) They (c) They	sed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be raise new issues that would require further corraise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloware not deemed to place the application in betal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(d) ☐ They NOT	present additional claims without canceling a creek. (See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
	dments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 s reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
6. Newly prop	posed or amended claim(s) would be all ble claim(s).	 	timely filed amendmei	nt canceling the
7. For purpose how the new The status Claim(s) all Claim(s) ob Claim(s) rej	es of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [wor amended claims would be rejected is provof the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: owed:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
	OTHER EVIDENCE			
because ap	it or other evidence filed after a final action, bur oplicant failed to provide a showing of good and rlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
entered bed	it or other evidence filed after the date of filing cause the affidavit or other evidence failed to o good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
	vit or other evidence is entered. An explanation RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
	est for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the a	attached Information <i>Discl</i> os <i>ure Statement</i> (s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
		/Deborah Yee/		
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1793		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly proposed amendment "V: 0.05 -0.50%" in claim 1 recited as a positive rather than optional element was not presented in the finally rejected claims and therefore would require further search and consideration.

Also Examiner maintains her position that claims would not patentably distinguish over publication 1 in view of publication 2 for the reasons set forth in office action dated November 17, 2009. In addition, it would be well within the skill of the artisan to modify the teaching of publication 1 by using slightly different but analogous materials known in the art that contain high Si and low Mn with 0.05-0.4%V, see cited reference, US patent 6,338,763